

Lee H. Rubin (State Bar #141331)
MAYER BROWN LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
Suite 300
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2000
(650) 331-2000
lrubin@mayerbrown.com

Robert E. Bloch (*pro hac vice*)
Gary A. Winters (*pro hac vice*)
Aimée D. Latimer-Zayets (*pro hac vice*)
MAYER BROWN LLP
1999 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006-1001
(202) 263-3000
rbloch@mayerbrown.com
gwinters@mayerbrown.com
alaimer-zayets@mayerbrown.com

Counsel for Defendant Cypress Semiconductor Corporation

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

**IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS
MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST
LITIGATION**

Master File 4:07-md-1819-CW

MDL No. 1819

This Document Relates To:

**ALL DIRECT AND INDIRECT
PURCHASER ACTIONS**

**STIPULATION AND ORDER
REGARDING DEFENDANT CYPRESS
SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION'S
FILING REPLY BRIEF IN EXCESS OF
PAGE LIMIT**

1 WHEREAS, on August 2, 2010, the Court ordered Cypress Semiconductor Corporation
2 (“Cypress”) to file a consolidated summary judgment motion on the claims of the Direct
3 Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) (Docket No. 1062);

4 WHEREAS, on August 4, 2010, the Court issued an order (Docket No. 1066) allowing
5 Cypress to have a five-page extension, or up to 30 pages, for its consolidated summary judgment
6 motion;

7 WHEREAS, on August 5, 2010 Cypress filed its consolidated Motion for Summary
8 Judgment or, in the Alternative, for Partial Summary Judgment (Docket No. 1068) (the
9 “Motion”);

10 WHEREAS, Cypress and Plaintiffs agreed to a five-page extension of the page limit for
11 Plaintiffs’ joint opposition to Cypress’s Motion, and the Court granted that extension on August
12 13, 2010 (Docket No. 1070);

13 WHEREAS, on August 24, 2010 Plaintiffs filed a 30-page Joint Opposition to Cypress’s
14 Motion;

15 WHEREAS, Cypress anticipates filing a reply brief in support of its Motion on
16 September 15, 2010, and anticipates needing to have a two-page extension, or up to 17 pages;

17 WHEREAS Cypress and Plaintiffs have conferred and have agreed that Cypress may
18 have a two-page extension for its reply brief;

19
20 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED BY UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL THAT:

21 Cypress may have a two-page extension, or up to 17 pages, for its Reply Brief in Support
22 of its Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the Alternative, for Partial Summary Judgment.

23
24 Dated: September 13, 2010

MAYER BROWN LLP

25 _____/s/

26 Gary A. Winters
27 Counsel for Defendant Cypress
28 Semiconductor Corporation

1 Dated: September 13, 2010

ZELLE HOFMANN VOELBEL &
MASON LLP

2
3 /s/

4 Christopher T. Micheletti
5 *Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser*
6 *Plaintiffs*

7 Dated: September 13, 2010

COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY

8 /s/

9 Neil Swartzberg
10 *Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser*
11 *Plaintiffs*

12 Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B), I hereby attest that the above signatories
13 concur in the filing of this document.

14 /s/ J. Joann Liao

15 J. Joann Liao

16 **ORDER**

17 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: September 14, 2010

19 

20 Hon. Claudia Wilken
21 United States District Court Judge